

VERSUS STATE

organ of the political action caucus

Number 5

March 1978

\$2.25

S. A. PAC

The Rhodesia PAC now has some thirty members and is growing fast. They are planning to issue their own organ "Solid State" (in Rhodesian slang, "solid" means dense and stupid). We of the U.S. National PAC warmly welcome this new Radical Anarcho-capitalist organization to our ranks. The rapid acceptance of Radical Anarcho-capitalist ideology among Rhodesian anti-statists is not surprising in view of their position as frontline defenders against a murderous marxist aggression and as victims of social democratic betrayal. As part of our effort to aid our brave allies we have mobilized pressure to have the following plank included in the Republican and Democratic parties of the U.S. demanding a reversal in the current policy of betrayal by the Carter-Young regime. A recent resolution submitted in caucus to the Republican Party of Washington State reads:

"Be it resolved that the Republican Party platform shall announce support for the recent settlement of black majority rule in Rhodesia and clearly denounce President Carter's Administration's continued demand for the inclusion of the Soviet-supported Marxist terrorist groups in the settlement. This shall be accompanied by a demand that all economic restrictions against trade with Rhodesia be lifted immediately, with full diplomatic recognition of the Rhodesian government restored at once."

TO: THE POLITICAL ACTION CAUCUS FROM: DIRECTOR, SOUTHERN AFRICA REGION

I have worked with the leadership of the PAC since 1972 and have much admiration for their capabilities. I came to this part of the world to involve myself militarily with the marxist invaders who were threatening a decent people and a vital source of strategic minerals.

At the request of the leadership of the PAC I helped form a regional branch for

Radical Anarcho-capitalism p.3

Efron Answered p.9

Natural Rights p.13

Warrior Ethic p.15

Our Law p.18

Free Speech p.22

Our Tasks p.23

Double Standard p.28

Southern Africa.

Upon my arrival here I found that the works of Ayn Rand had an avid readership. It was not hard finding dynamic Rhodesians to join the organization. Our major accomplishment to date has been preventing a certain religious group from having the works of Rand banned in Rhodesia.

Rhodesia is not a perfect society, far from it. Wartime restrictions on currency dealings and government protection of certain industries to overcome sanctions is very distasteful. However, on balance, Rhodesia is one of the most livable countries in the world for an individualist. Even South Africa which is repressive in some ways has much to be said in its defense.

The problems in this part of the world are formidable. Rhodesia has two main tribal groups at each others throats and South Africa has nine.

Rhodesia probably has the best race relations of any country in the world. Whites, Blacks, Asians and Colored work in harmony. The main source of friction rests in that the two major tribes in Rhodesia have rivalries going back 150 years.

Apartheid does not exist in Rhodesia. Sixty percent of the security forces are black and new black officers and police join the forces in ever-increasing numbers. Most of the terrorist's victims are black.

The problems of the PAC in Southern Africa are different from those in the U.S., Canada and Australia. While committed to dismantling the State and removing it from all military and police functions, we are eyeball to eyeball with Marxist imperialism directed and supplied from Moscow. Fighting major battles with the captain and crew of a burning ship is singularly unprofitable. Under their present forms of government, Rhodesia and South Africa hold forth the possibility of change. Under "Peoples Republics" only civil war and desolation are possible. Once the fires are out, and the ship has reached a safe port, we will deal with the major changes that need to come about. For the time being we are recruiting, indoctrinating, and making the community aware of us. Most of the men in the organization spend half their time at their jobs and PAC activities, and the other half increasing the intelligence of terrorists by 7.62mm.

More than four hundred Americans are serving with the Rhodesian security forces. Many are Vietnam veterans. All are anti-marxist. Some of these have found their way into the PAC. What they have seen out here does little to give them faith in the American government.

Living on the frontlines has shown Rhodesians the virtues of Détente. A rugged individualism has made many Southern Africans ripe for the PAC.

Later this year I will be returning to the United States to work with the PAC directors. Rhodesian staff will take over the Southern Africa branch and keep up the momentum. On their behalf I wish our comrades in the United States and around the world success in their hard fought battles to attain freedom.

-Yours in freedom, Ragnar D., Director, Southern Africa

RADICAL Anarcho-capitalism

Undoubtedly, there will be those who will cavil at our prefixing of Anarcho-capitalism with "Radical". Imagine the irritation of all those well-intentioned folk in the Libertarian Party who so desperately want to prevent splintering and disagreement and keep us harnessed together like so many chariot race-horses wearing blinders in the spirit of common enterprise in spite of our "petty differences". Well, it won't work. Not because cooperating is beyond us, but because the chariot driver(s) so obviously don't know their way. In fact, some seem to be trying to charge sideways into the Grandstand, others are just dead still. Most have no heart for the race. No! We are no longer content to follow those who have lost their way or never knew it from the beginning! Yes Virginia! There is a new faction on the stage of the anti-statist movement and it's going to ruin all of this carefully contrived harmonious prattle and whitewash which has prevented the dialectic so necessary to our ideological maturity. Oh dreaded apocalypse, it's the end of innocence for the radical libertarian movement!

We call ourselves "Radical" because we no longer think that rational discourse is sufficient to deter the coercive predilections of our statist enemies. Anarcho-capitalism as it presently stands, is a great theory of how human beings can function together and realize their individual destinies without resort to initiating force -- even the institutional use of violatory coercion. It is also the great critique of that age-old, violently destructive, monopsonistic anachronism, the State. But a theory and critique are not enough, however elaborate, truthful, incisive, and grand they may be. Anarcho-capitalism as it exists is an amalgam of Objectivist epistemology and ethics, Natural Rights Theory in law, Methodological Individualism in social science analysis and the theory of Subjective Value and the modern "Austrian School" in political economy. But nowhere in all of this is an analysis of what we must do to end the State. We know the problem and we have a good inkling of the good things to come once we resolve the problem but Anarcho-capitalist philosophy provides no guidance, strangely enough, on how to surmount the problem. In fact, it is strongly intimated that we should do nothing about it except complain. And complain we have! For two centuries we have burst every balloon of statist blather but to no avail!

We are Radical Anarcho-capitalists because we propose to do more than merely complain or "educate" others about our misgivings. For us, philosophy is not merely a rational set of premises which abstracts the workings of nature, but a system to tell us how to deal efficiently with the world in which we live. Although we think Anarcho-capitalist philosophy is generally correct, it obviously has been deficient in getting us where we want to go.

We are not content with the defeatism and complacency of the present Anarcho-capitalist position which offers no plan of action except to advocate our amalgamation with a hoard of confused and often fainthearted minarchists who are but one shading away from being Conservatives. Yes, we think the Libertarian Party is, in historical terms, a belated step forward to absolutely necessary political action but, unfortunately it has not been accompanied by the development of a programme of strategy and tactics. As a political entity, the LP is a fake. It is a compromise entity of minimal statists and various anarchistic types which has "agreed" to go nowhere or perform anything of significance. The LP is an opiate for a politically impotent subclass of young middle-class intellectuals who cannot come to grips with the radical ideological necessities of their philosophy. They are addicted to the comforts and perquisites of the "American Dream" and somehow they hope they can make revolutionary political change with the

niceties of Roberts Rules. After more than five years, they have no plan, their candidacies fail miserably, and their influence on the workaday masses is non-existent. All this notwithstanding, one fails to detect debate as to whether our programme should be geared for the abolition of the State or for its minimalization.

Instead of a manifesto of concrete objectives, the Party has theatrically proclaimed its opposition to the "cult of the omnipotent state". This is empty rhetoric which no one really understands because it is not related to any ideological plan of action. What first comes to mind of any political worker is: What is the State? Who is the State? Which State(s) do we oppose? What may and can we do to the State? When, how, and why, and with what, with whom, against whom, for whom, by whom do we act? The difference between the left-moderate Anarcho-capitalism which runs the Party sub-rosa now and the Radical Anarcho-capitalist position is the difference between philosophy and ideology. The latter offers a plan of concrete action to achieve in the real world of political-economy what the former has determined is good. We are Radical Anarcho-capitalists because we will settle for nothing less than the abolition of the State and we are prepared to do everything necessary for that end. Radical Anarcho-capitalism asserts the imminent desirability of living heroically not merely to create good but to war against conscious evil. We assert that in different periods of history the individual faces different problems which he must meet or, failing that, relinquish some degree of ethical integrity and personal identity.

Living as a conscious being means identifying a standard of value and acting upon it rigorously as long as it remains valid no matter what the existential risks. A heroic personality upon achieving a mature identity chooses a goal which advances his standard of value within a world-historical context. It is the ultimate act borne of a self-sovereign, conscious being to dedicate his action to further the idea of his life -- not for others, or for a better future, but as a tribute to his own self-esteem and the realization of his identity.

The abolition of the State and the long, dangerous, arduous and uncertain struggle to that objective is the only worthy world-historical objective available in our time for a heroic personality. Everything which does not direct itself to that end is antagonistic, contradictory or frivolous to the essential work of the Radical Anarcho-capitalist movement. We are not arguing, to be sure, against the individual's absolute right to live a non-heroic existence of bourgeois complacency, but as Radical Anarcho-capitalists we disdain all forms of comfort-grubbing cowardice and careerist accommodation of the State. We consider this as symptomatic of a syndrome of self-debasement and depersonalization in which addiction to momentary comforts and security impairs the attainment of a fully matured identity. Our opposition is not towards comfort, luxuries or successful pursuit of careers per se but against the fixation on these as a surrogate for personal identity, or worse still, as a self-delusion against the reality of a life lived as a serf of the State. Radical Anarcho-capitalism considers life under any form of arbitrarily and coercively imposed jurisdictional monopoly, thus any form of statism, as an insufferable environment for a healthy human personality. Thus, all evasion or accommodation which does not have as its intended purpose active struggle against the State, is indicative of a personal capitulation to a form of lower identity and esteem.

To live free is to fight against statism -- to bring turmoil to the statist society, to foil its plans, to foment opposition, to incite physical overthrow of its institutions, to split its forces and set them at odds with each other. In our era, achieving personal liberation is to work relentlessly to break the power of the State. There can be no valid personal satisfaction until that is achieved -- until modern slavery has been abolished. There can be no self-respect or peace of conscience for those who hide in momentary comfort cringing in anticipation of the statist forces

closing around them in the temporary interstices of a society not fully solidified yet into a total despotism.

To be a Radical Anarcho-capitalist is not only to be irreconcilably opposed to the State but to be willing to fight the State as permitted within the realities of social, political and economic conditions. In contrast to the Anarcho-individualist, we are not squeamish about entering war and politics. Our present world structure revolves around political warfare at all levels of social organization. Truly we want a world without war and politics just as surely as we would choose a world without disease and poverty but for us struggle in politics and in actual physical combat is a necessary and good one. It is the dominant aspect of our world in our time. A better condition will not occur unless we are prepared to meet the challenge of our antagonists and perform our task. We must break the back of their power and their force and abolish their arbitrary authority. The full expression of a heroic personality requires fighting back with the will to victory. Repression of our natural proclivities to strike back and defeat our oppressors has been disastrous to the libertarian movement both in psychological and political terms.

As Radical Anarcho-capitalists we repudiate both the notion that history is inevitably progressive -- thus leading to the eventual withering away of the State, or that history inevitably leads to ever-intensifying forms of despotism. History, for us, is open! The recent victories of totalitarian statism can be overturned in relatively short order and we can march to victory. Once we've done it, it will have seemed that the process was somehow inevitable and foreordained by a universal mechanism. Victory has a way of amplifying despair among the defeated and mesmerizing the masses with acceptance of the "inevitable". On the other hand, we must fully realize that the contemporary victories of totalitarian statism form the basis for a complete victory for their side which may be virtually unchallengeable. We are in a grave situation but the outcome depends on which side has the greater intelligence, combativeness, courage, discipline and will. Everything else is secondary. History is shaped by heroic personalities or it falls more or less to accident. The other side has shown they are determined to leave as little as possible to accident. We must mobilize to do likewise.

This is the basis of our radical world-historicalism: we are the self-appointed caretakers and designers of history. Others may do what they wish, but so will we! And our wish is to achieve a free and just order of life. There is nothing else of significance for which to live. Let others boggle themselves with the trivia which distracts them from achieving a greater identity in harmony with the requirements of conscious existence. Creators of revolutionary change, whatever it may be, are never invited or made welcome by the established order, they must fight for their very survival and conquer the old order.

Our world-historical vision and our personal quest for victory leads to another important cleavage with the traditional Anarchists, that of class affiliation. Although we live in the fullest adherence to a Rational Egoist Ethic, it does not prevent us from recognizing the values of group loyalties and ties. Whereas we see generally a lack of mutual support and esprit de corps within the Libertarian Party and anti-statist movement, we advocate full support of our own class i.e. the Creator Class. Our Class, however, is not limited to those who tend to work manually but to all those who revere the magnification of productive value through intelligence. Thus, we totally renounce the class arguments of the Marxian camp-followers who call themselves Anarcho-communists.

Proceeding from our class consciousness, we reject tendencies within the libertarian movement which tend to paralyze militant political activism such as the various

expressions of altruist-collectivist Residualism and anarchoid Idealism. For instance, we are opposed to the Residualist acceptance of the minimal state and the prohibition of fraud as both of these effectively render the achievement of a non-coercive society impossible. We are equally opposed to Idealism which paralyzes the movement with its polemic against political action. This has effectively reduced the LP's means to that of "educationalist" campaigns.

The consequence of Residualist and Idealist tendencies has been to divert, distract and dilute the strength and vision of the libertarian movement. Because of it, our limited opportunity at this point in history may be lost to us. The Objectivist philosophical movement, although embodying a robust assertion of Rational Egoism, has been disastrous in its disillusionment of what should have been a radical capitalist vanguard of the Anarcho-capitalist Revolution. Under the ideologically inept leadership of Ayn Rand, many precious years were lost in the formation of a revolutionary political leadership. Instead of guiding her acolytes toward technically effective political work, Rand actually squelched any tendency for political action -- preferring to emphasize the impossible pipe-dream of a capitalist cultural "renaissance".

As Radical Anarcho-capitalists we are not at all surprised by the "Objectivist debacle" (as it is called by Edith Efron¹). It is altogether predictable for several important reasons. Heading the list is Rand's minimal state thesis, so savagely demolished by Roy Childs, Jr., that it never held the slightest chance of providing an intellectually or ideologically defensible basis for radical political change. The fiery, egoist rebelliousness of her fictional works in the first two decades of her writing career was not ideologically translated in her non-fictional philosophical writings. In sum, Rand's Objectivist movement never amounted to more than a romanticized Conservatism revolving around an erratic and often irrational cult leader. The only noteworthy effect of the Objectivist movement was the widespread adoption among a significant minority of middle class youth of a rigorously devout adherence to a non-religious ethic. Unfortunately, this devotion and rigor had no effective outlet in concrete achievements. Rand failed to anticipate that commercial, intellectual, scientific or artistic accomplishments in themselves were entirely inadequate to fulfill the revolutionary political requirements of her egoist ethical base. She failed to understand that an atheist-egoist personality more or less freed from the psycho-epistemological shackles of altruist-collectivism cannot function happily in a statist environment, unless it is actively combatting statism. Strangely enough, Rand depicted the enormous anguish and frustration experienced by Objectivist-type heroes in a statist society in her novels. She has them dynamiting welfare housing projects and establishing hidden (and illegal) communities and performing commando-style raids and shooting guards but in real life she demanded of her followers a meticulous observance of the law. Political involvement was stringently limited to voting for Nixon and Ford and writing letters to the editor. To this day, Rand continues to excoriate and proscribe the Libertarian Party. Rand effectively produced a movement which combined the philosophy of a lion (more or less) with the political ideology of a rabbit. Such a dysfunctional monster was bound to be shortlived.

The Objectivist debacle which continues to afflict the libertarian movement is motivated by a deep psychological misapprehension of the needs of a rational egoist personality. Further complicating this is the peculiar class psychology of its natural constituency. Here also, Radical Anarcho-capitalist ideology offers an approach to mass psychosocial dynamics as well as a superior insight into the personal requirements of rational egoism. We assert that pacifism and withdrawal from political struggle are contrary to the natural needs of a rational-egoist in our era. The white middle-class youth who flocked to Rand, and who continue to inundate the libertarian movement have suffered a terrible debilitation. One observes that they have been aseptically sheltered from childhood violence and sexual precocity. Their

lives are almost foreordained to the achievement of programmatic career objectives and material-financial acquisition. They are a generation which has not achieved a rite of passage into maturity. Their intellectual distrust of totalitarian statism is not matched by an authentic trust in their own strength or in a fully achieved independence from the protective shelter of authoritarian institutions. This psychology of inadequacy in the concrete realm can only be worked out in our era in political struggle. Otherwise the entire potential constituency of rational egoism will be consigned to an emasculated Conservatism.

The psycho-social character of the Objectivist rank-and-file which is also equally descriptive of many "radical libertarians" is one disposed to view political action in a pacifistic, reformist and evolutionary mode. Their psychological orientation towards personal distaste for physical combat and their class position as the educated and upwardly mobile upper middle-class elite has strengthened their tendency to rationalize a de facto acceptance of the State. There is a widespread implicit acceptance that the State can be changed through purely reform measures advanced by a series of rational object lessons to the masses and to the administrators and politicians of the inherent efficiency of the free market. The view is that the State is painting itself in a corner ideologically by the increasingly obvious contradictions of its previous interventions. Thus, goes the rationale, people will be looking for alternatives to the statist mess and the Libertarian Party will gain power to throw the rascals out and depromulgate their policies.

An extension of this naiveté is the even more delirious view that once the minimal state is achieved, the forces for complete abolition will be allowed to go on to throw out the work of the minarchists. The libertarian movement is pictured by many as a happy train with the minarchists riding only as far as "Constitutional Republic" Station, thence, cheerily waving goodbye to their erstwhile friends the Anarchists as they chug forth to "Abolition" Station. We Radical Anarcho-capitalists have no intention of staying on the minarchist "line" because we know, that just past "Constitutional Republic" Station is our wreck and destruction. No, we want this vehicle to get on track to the abolition of the State. We don't mind if the minarchists ride with us as long as they are willing to pay the fare and take the bumps!

As Radical Anarcho-capitalists, we find that attitude which views the State as lending itself to substantial reforms, i.e., a change resulting in the voluntary acceptance by statists of a fundamental weakening of the State's power over its subjects, as ridiculous and incredible! How can anyone of sound mind believe in the light of history and the existing structure of world political economy that the great predator, the State, will accept a threat to its interests? All law, constitutions, and governing institutions, whatever the original intentions of their founders, have become mere tools to preserve the power of the statists and their constituencies. Let any group seriously threaten that power, and the State will quickly drop whatever is left of its pretense of legal equality and constitutional adherence and smash its adversaries. Even now, when there is no significant challenge to their power, the statists in the United States, generally acknowledged as relatively better, have worked terrible violations of individual rights and openly abrogated the constitutional basis of law. There is no longer a constitutional protection of life and property in this country! There is no dependable basis for recourse to constitutional protection of rational law. We live in a social-democratic state controlled by one party which has raised legal barriers to the rise of any non social-democratic political party. The LP, or even the Republicans, cannot win ever (unless they become social democratic), because their natural constituencies are constrained by electoral law from helping them. More significantly, the present structure of political economy, legislated into existence and ramified by administrative law, has created dominant constituencies for the social democrats. We live in a corporate state which is solidifying its structure and we have not the political power to prevent it through

reform tactics alone.

The idea of a neutral State which permits reformist, democratic change, no longer applies, if it ever did! The constraints we see now, although substantive, are modest compared to what will occur overnight if the LP, or something like it, should begin to succeed.

Empirical evidence of this lies no further away than in those wonderful democracies, so ostensibly sensitive to the rights of its citizens -- Canada, Britain, and Denmark. In Canada, evidence is mounting that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (a sort of combined CIA and FBI) has been waging disruptive activities against the loyal opposition parties and now, the Trudeau government is placing enormous legal pressure on the opposition party to back down from its incisive criticism. The situation is even worse in Britain where government operated postal services now collaborate with union strong-arm groups against non-union firms. In Denmark, we have the spectacle of Mogen Glistrup, head of the anti-taxation Progress Party, jailed on trumped charges of tax-fraud.

The Radical Anarcho-capitalist position on the State, thus, is that it can be trusted only to do one thing, use every power it has to trample its enemies. No matter how peaceful you are, or how soft-spoken and benevolent you are, the statist will find a way of arresting and imprisoning you. And it will not necessarily be the direct and open police-power of the State which will attack you but their constituents. They can send in a few hundred union thugs with clubs and chains to your meetings and beat your brains in and they will not be reported in the statist press, nor will you get protection from the police who will look the other way! Your hard-won elections (if any) will be lost through vote fraud and other manipulations. Your leaders will be assassinated. Firms and groups friendly to you will be either bought off or intimidated. You will be slandered and harassed on trumped charges in the courts. Gangs of armed thugs will burst into your homes and murder your families. A good example is the recent kidnap and murder of West German capitalist, Hans Martin Schleyer, one among numerous collective-statist-instigated atrocities being employed to intimidate oppositional forces in Western Europe. Government investigative agencies will keep your active elements under constant surveillance and make every attempt to prosecute them. You will be denied jobs and admission to institutions of higher education and passed over for promotion. (A situation which already exists in the form of Affirmative Action programs which not only discriminate against white males but include none-too-subtle criteria such as "community service" designed to screen out rational egoists). All of this the State apparatus can do and does now. In an "authoritarian" situation, the sky is the limit.

As Radical Anarcho-capitalists we have no illusions about the State. We expect that all governments will continue to close ranks in maintaining a world order against their subject peoples. They will come to abuse all libertarians and critics of the State, no matter how peaceful and "reasonable", as scapegoats for their failures. Even at this stage, we can detect gross contradictions and cowardice in the so-called "human rights" campaign of the Carter administration. The future of human rights is clearly announced in the latest debacles and capitulations of the Helsinki Accord representatives at Belgrade this year. In the past year we have seen the annihilation of over one-million persons of the Cambodian middle class effectively disregarded by the left statist-controlled institutions and demands by the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., Andrew Young and British Foreign Secretary David Owen for inclusion of the Marxist terrorists in the recent Rhodesian settlement for black majority rule when, in fact, the terrorists are representative of a small minority and have committed numerous atrocities on the civilian population. These, and numerous other events, are confirmation of our view that statism is rapidly evolving worldwide into more

CONTINUED ON PAGE 29

Splitting Up!

The following is our reply to Edith Efron's recent attack on the Anarchist philosophical dominance of the libertarian movement.

Edith Efron has provided an extremely interesting insight into the fears and delusions of the minarchist-Objectivist mentality in her recent article ("Warning to Constitutional Republicans" Reason, February, 1978). She has also illuminated some important tactical and strategic errors which may be in the process of being made by Anarchists. Efron's main thesis is that the libertarian movement is being led to disaster by its ideologically dominant anarchist faction, notably Murray N. Rothbard and Roy Childs Jr. et al. Essentially, she identifies this coming disaster as a product of Rothbardian strategy to coopt the Left by jettisoning the remainder of the pro-nationalist, pro-constitutionalist, and pro-corporate-industrialist ethos in a direct appeal to the anti-statist sentiments of the Left. This, she predicts, will not advance libertarian ideals of individual freedom, the sanctity of private property and laissez-faire industrial capitalism, but will advance the cause of the Left whose basic historical agenda is unmistakably the destruction of the American Republic by usurping its capitalist industrialist strength. She might have said (with greater succinctness and effect I think) that a united front with the radical Left more often works to their advantage. Because they are well organized and militant, and have well defined and historically persistent objectives, the Left generally wins -- unless it meets a tougher, stronger, more organized and efficient ideological force.

But Efron is really not primarily interested in a thorough analysis of the present left-moderate, Anarcho-capitalist strategy, what she is after, quite obviously, is to rally the conservative minarchist forces for a counter-attack and split. Thus, her main emphasis is not on the tactical value of this alliance(?) but on the vileness of Rothbard's erstwhile friends. And undoubtedly they are a bad bunch -- every rotten kook and dastardly anti-capitalist, anti-traditionalist American bum is paraded for us: from New Left, LSD guru, Timothy Leary, to the rabid Maoist, Institute-for-Policy-Studies-think-tanker, Marcus Raskin. Undisputably, the moderate-left Anarcho-capitalists with their organs Libertarian Review and (the newly published) Inquiry have dragged in an awful lot of commie scum into the libertarian intellectual stream of consciousness.

And this psycho-political (and ultimately psycho-epistemological) influence is Efron's fundamental fear. She adopts Ayn Rand's bitterest attack on the "libertarian movement" as one "doomed" to hippie degeneracy owing to its lack of a "...serious metaphysical, epistemological and ethical base...". But here Efron errs by omission in not explaining to us why Rand would never rebut the powerful challenge to her limited-government thesis made by Roy Childs Jr. After all, if the libertarian movement is an intellectual failure, why did Rand avoid a direct opportunity to defend her position (and crush the opposition)-- especially in view of the nature of the challenge which came in the form of an open letter addressed directly to Madame Rand. The answer is obvious. Rand's thesis is flawed and it cannot be defended against the Anarcho-capitalist challenge. The subsequent capitulation of Rand's Objectivist movement and with it, the minarchist position, resulted not only from an intentional sublimation of the quarrel by LP'ers anxious to unite every available body under the frail standard of a political party ideologically beset on all sides and without a chance for success. It really resulted because the limited state position doesn't hold under close scrutiny. Even the defenders of "limited government such as

Tibor Machan, and Robert Nozick have gone through fantastic contortions to justify it. Their rationalizations and theoretical acrobatics have failed to conceal that the State is, in fact, a "mass murderer", an anachronism unnecessary in modern society and an ethically indefensible institution. The State, i.e. any state, American or otherwise, constitutional, communist or social democrat, represents a coercively imposed and maintained jurisdictional monopoly which abrogates the absolute right of the individual to dispose of his own life and property by offering his services -- any service -- for voluntary purchase on the open market. Military, police and court services are not exceptional in terms of the universal, objective principles which form the Rational Egoist Ethic.

An individual, any individual, has the absolutely defensible ethical right to compete on the open market in offering whatever service he wishes unless he has voluntarily and explicitly agreed otherwise. No jurisdictional monopoly may impose against him a constraint (or threat of such) on the use of his life and property in a voluntary transaction. There is no rationally valid basis for a coercive monopoly over the use of defensive force asserted by any particular group of persons over others -- and any attempt to enforce such a monopoly of force must always involve the use of initiatory force. Thus, any philosopher advocating such premise must either be incredibly naive or covering some dark ulterior motive.

Rand's political economy of limited statism is most definitely at odds with her quite valid and valuable clarification (not discovery) of Rational Egoism. In essence, her conservatism got the better of her radical sense of life. What Rand did in the forties and fifties was largely wiped out by her growing conservatism in the sixties and seventies.

Although we can agree with Efron that the minarchists were indeed traumatized by the "Objectivist debacle" (which we understand to mean Rand's ridiculous split with Nathaniel Branden and her confused ideological blunders in espousing Nixon and Ford) the rank-and-file of the libertarian movement are certainly none the worse for having lost their innocence on the so-called "affirmative aspects" of the Randian cultural ethos. According to Efron these are: "the value of nation, the necessity of national culture, the value of a government, the need to defend the country, and the need for a radical reformer to formulate a political position which integrates his proposals for change with his desires to preserve".

In Germany they had a fellow who did precisely all of those things, unfortunately the National Socialist regime of Adolph Hitler failed in its objectives. This basic outline of nationalist cultural and political goals is the basis for all "great" statistes -- DeGaulle, Churchill, Chiang Kai-shek, the Shah of Iran, Abdel Nasser, Muamar Gadaffi -- they all have had great plans to preserve and develop the "affirmative" aspects of "national" culture and government. There can be little doubt that these men along with others such as Lenin, Mao and Ho have all been, as Efron describes: "reverent revolutionaries".

Efron is afraid that in the capitulation of the minarchists to the anarchists, the "outraged love" of the "reverent revolutionary" will be replaced with "vindictive malice". The problem is, however, that whatever there was to love in any reasonable sense in our "constitutional republic" has long ago disappeared. One can wonder what Efron would have us love in our present "national culture". Let's see, could she mean our constitutional tradition? We can hardly love what it has permitted -- the IRS, the U.S. Postal Service, compulsory public education, forced bussing, Affirmative Action, the draft, the forced internment of Japanese-Americans...Perhaps she means our glorious military tradition financed by worthless fiat "Continental", annihilating aboriginal populations, bullying our neighbors with gunboat diplomacy and forcing

millions to fight overseas in alien conflicts and wasting 150 billion dollars and 50,000 American lives in Vietnam. As an acolyte of Ayn Rand she must mean our heroic corporate industrial "leaders" as an essential part of national culture. Perhaps we could have loved Edison, Carnegie, Ford and Hunt -- those nineteenth century and early twentieth-century giants who built the foundations for what exists now, but we can hardly avoid detesting the corporate fascist pigs who, under the guise of "free enterprise" attempt to hide their oligopoly control of our economy. Shall we love General Motors, Standard Oil, U.S. Steel and ITT? Or maybe Efron means the National Endowment for the Arts, the Public Broadcasting Corporation, the Bicentennial Commission, the League of Women Voters, Chamber of Commerce, Kiwanis, or Lions Club. All of these by conventional, prevailing standards are indeed significant elements of "national culture". Where and what is this "national culture" that as rational and objective persons we should be devoting our love?

Efron's tocsin to rally round the flag of "national culture" should provide a coup de grace to any remaining belief that constitutional republicans (i.e. minarchists) are heading in the same direction with radical libertarians -- a designation which includes those for whom the sanctity and desirability of individual liberty is eminently superior to any tradition or institution. For us, the desirability of national culture, government and defense of any area, however homogeneous, historically and culturally integrated, and "defensible" it may be, can never supersede the value of one individual's right to his life and property. The difference between ourselves and the Efron-Randite minimal statist, is not that we cannot or do not value culture and its artifacts employed and esteemed in common by American or any other grouping, or that we do not value the proper and efficacious voluntary defense of America, or that we are opposed to persons cooperating to provide all desirable services in maintaining order over their rightful properties, but that we are unwilling to sacrifice our rights or those of anyone to uphold a polity which has so clearly abandoned the causes of liberty, justice, private property, free commerce, and reasoned thought. We cannot respect, much less love, the polity which under Nixon licked the feet of the grotesque tyranny of Mao's China, nor can we love or defend the government which is willing to sacrifice the relative freedom and prosperity of seventeen million human beings on the island of Taiwan to assuage the pique of the mainland rulers. But in spite of all this, and here we only touch on one or two items in a vast array of deceit and betrayals against any rationally-conceivable standard of decency perpetrated by the U.S. government over the past century, Rand and her acolytes continue to espouse the American State. In spite of the availability of libertarian candidates, Rand has clearly supported Nixon and Ford. Quite clearly, these people are not on the same track with us.

And this is the real point of contention which underlies Efron's polemic, not the fact of some libertarians having, perhaps quite mistakenly, intellectually commingled their efforts with anti-anti-communists, as she would have us believe, but the very real fear that Anarcho-capitalism has successfully taken philosophical command over the radical libertarian movement once badly misled by Madame Rand into a romanticized Conservatism and debauched chauvinism. There can be little doubt that Efron is foraging in our camp for human ideological cannon-fodder for the desperate forces of national Conservatism. Anyone acquainted with the anemic youth-base of the Conservative movement will readily understand why Efron and her Randist friends are so anxious to siphon off some of the robust blood of our movement.

In this light, it is crucial to note how Efron reverts to the bloody-flag-of-communism-smear-tactics of McCarthy-ism to reconvert the ostensibly addled-by-repression constitutional republicans back to the old chauvinism. Nowhere in her long polemic does Ms. Efron once refer to the basic premise of her position, or describe specifically what her national cultural chauvinism or pro-government stance involves.

Although she is critical that "The anarchist perception of America's reality is not a political analysis..." nowhere does she offer a hint of what is the political problem in America or how we should approach it. Her criticism of the Anarchist poverty of political analysis is not without ground but certainly we cannot rely, as she strongly imputes, on the conservative wisdom of such as Milton Friedman or the 'neo-liberal'-ism of Irving Kristol et al. Undoubtedly Friedman should be commended for his mitigative influence over the abhorrent governments of Chile and Israel but we must never forget his ethically and economically evil advocacy of national monetary monopolies. And if Kristol has squealed against some of the side-effects of welfare-statism as Efron trumpets, he certainly does not advocate, or even hint, that a return to minimal state constitutional republicanism is desirable. The overall effect of these "Neo-Conservatives" is analogous to the perceptual impact of minor sparks emitted from the wheels of a massive locomotive. Efron vastly overrates their importance. These gentlemen are indeed worthy of close scrutiny and may help to accentuate the turn to a modern post-statist intellectual drift but they must look to us for leadership and direction -- not the reverse. Nor can we depend on the deceased Ludwig von Mises or on the economist-philosopher Friederich A. Hayek who is not a political strategist.

In actuality, following Efron out of the radical libertarian movement effectively means working for someone like Reagan. It means, should the Efronite faction win out in the LP, turning that party into a 'neo-liberal'-ized version of the American Independent Party. Efron's drift would mean the death effectively of the radical libertarian movement and the possibility in our era for a post-statist society and culture. For the minimal statist like Efron and Rand, the greatest thing which could happen is the return of the late eighteenth century. Constitutional republicanism is to them the apex of possible human achievement. They cannot see that the only really good aspects of American culture and history have been those of limited anarchy, not of the limited state which is always deficient at all levels in all forms. Right from the beginning, constitutional republicanism has been a failure in serving any valid purpose. We would have been better off without a federal government or its constitution. From the beginning, the American State has been the progenitor of monopoly interests. The grotesque expansion of the State sector is a natural and evolutionary consequence of a perverted statist form of "capitalism".

Efron's position constitutes a clever psychological distortion of the actual situation. It is a dangerously appealing enticement to the latent chauvinism of rightist-leaning libertarians. With the world around us running completely amuck, combined with the anguishing defeats of our misguided war of "containment" against the communist bloc, there is an urgent desire to assert the affirmative aspects of our American civilization. It is so easy to fall prey to a reactionary "national culture" fascism as similarly occurred in Weimar Germany. Already we can observe very similar "Decline of the West" style hysteria in such National Review-touted works as Jean Raspail's The Camp of the Saints. Psychologically, the American middle class youth is in reality only inches away emotionally from marching to the tune of an American Fuehrer. There is a terrible vacuum in American political ideology today. We, as the most advanced society on earth, are ripe for entry into the post-statist era but our strength in this epochal mission has been gravely weakened by the Objectivist debacle. This could be tragic in the context of the reactionary forces rising to fill that vacuum on both the Right and the Left. Efron's attempt to revive chauvinist and pro-statist sentiments of residual rightists is not merely misguided but the work of a convinced reactionary.

I, for one, welcome Efron's call for a resumption of the debate over the legitimacy and function of the State. It can only expand the ranks of Anarcho-capitalism at the expense of the Statists (minimal or otherwise). In fact, obfuscating the differences in maintaining a nervous alliance within the LP, has retarded the expan-

CONTINUED ON PAGE 31

Consciousness, Identity, and Natural Rights

The right of a conscious entity to its own life is an objectively definable outcome of its volitional nature. In other words, the right to oneself and one's extracorporeal possessions are indeed a fact of nature. The critics of the "natural right" premise suffer a misunderstanding of the nature of human consciousness and of life itself. This misunderstanding is partially attributable to the shallowness of libertarian philosophy on the relationship of identity, consciousness and existence. For example, in a recent article, John A. Goodson and David M. Longinotti ("Those 'Natural Rights Aren't'; Reason, September 1977, p. 34) takes some easy but well-merited potshots at some unquestioned libertarian boilerplate. They draw attention to the questionable idea that an objective rationale can be directly inferred from an unrefined standard of organismic existence. Quite naturally it cannot, or when it served our momentary convenience we should permit ourselves to descend to the predatory behavior analogous to some large carnivores. The point is that a well-functioning conscious being does not act merely to sustain its corporeal existence but its ethical self-identity. True, humans employing reason to some extent, prey on others for their sustenance but in the process they betray everything of ultimate significance in their lives in the process. A fully developed human being does not "survive" as a mobile piece of meat which betrays its highest informational patterns for the sake of temporary advantage because by its nature a conscious, self-reflecting, self-directing being lives in its own mind. Consciousness is a phenomenon of nature. The concept of identity, as is the case of all concepts, is also an irreducible and ever-present aspect of nature. Identity is not a reification of simpler, unrelated items of nature, it is the name given to the most interrelated patterning of things -- the abstract of the personality. In a self-conscious being able to reflect on the value of its existence for itself, identity is the abstract for its Self: the thing which ultimately experiences and values. One does not have to resort to Platonist ideal forms to acknowledge the presence of this conscious self.

That many persons are bereft of an "integrated personality" i.e. one in which a central ethical standard guides the preservation of an abstracted concept of self above all else, does not suffice as an ultimate logical coup de grace against the objective validity of ethical standards and, thus, the idea of "right". The term "nature" is often employed simultaneously with two meanings (as it is in the Goodson and Longinotti article). When Ayn Rand employs the term, she means the ultimate and universal structure of the human species which is inescapable in its consequence. This is not the same "nature" as the colloquial "human nature" which indiscriminately incorporates ephemeral, transient and often patently diseased states. For example, it is not ineluctable in human "nature" to suffer cancer or cholera. Just as obviously, one does not have to be a thief or a murderer. But to be human, one must exist corporeally, be conscious, and maintain an identity. These are inescapable consequences of being "human".

Goodson and Longinotti carry over their confusion of ephemeral nature with ultimate ineluctable nature in attempting to argue from the apparent ambiguity of human identity. They assert that if, as Ayn Rand asserts, humans cannot live other than as humans, their conduct is (ultimately), determined by their nature, then their argument follows, that since human's do in fact plunder, that their nature is something other than what Rand asserts it is and, thus, must be! Or as they say, "...to maintain that a human can have characteristics that are not human is to assert that A can be not-A, thus attempting to deny the law of identity." This is a good example of post hoc ergo propter hoc fallacy. It posits that since human conduct is often

savage, it is by "nature" ineluctably savage. It confuses ephemeral conditions with the basic structure of human personality. Human identity is the capacity for consciously reasoned choice not the mechanically predetermined necessity of reasoned choice. In fact, intimating that if being capable of reasoned choice demands that all choice be reasoned or the entity is no longer capable, thus, not what it was originally classed, is to misunderstand consciousness itself. It works on trial and error. The world is so constructed that the same action never attains exactly the same result. In fact, the Universe of possibilities is so immense, that consciousness is a natural response of adaptive evolution to complex environmental uncertainties threatening organismic survival. The crucial characteristic of reasoned choice which is a capacity of a developed consciousness is that it is changeable and often lacking. Human nature in order to be capable of reasoned choice must also be vulnerable to error. You can't have it any other way. A is A (once one identifies "A" in its essentials). Savagery is an error. It is a lack of reasoning ability which comes of the overall structure of consciousness.

Rand in her polemic to emphasize the positive aspects of human nature and render it heroic, fails to provide a balanced explanation of the nature of error, thus, leaving Natural Rights theory open to attack.

Human identity cannot be defined by the statistical performance of a diseased population. Goodson and Longinotti miss the entire point of human volitional nature which is, by the way, a phenomenal fact of nature (or there would be no disagreement possible between us).

Though it is within man's range of behavior to initiate violence it is ultimately at odds with his fully developed nature. Not recognizing the justifiable possession of others to themselves is an exceedingly dangerous way of life. It not only establishes a motive for revenge but a precedent for others to do the same. It destroys the fabric of human relationships which produces life-giving wealth. The concept of "right" is not a subjective invention but an objectively derived abstraction from the nature of conscious existence. Awareness of what one is can only have meaning according to a standard. The standard, to be objective, cannot be limited to one's subjective desires but must, insofar as is possible, encompass universal principles. Meeting the highest standard possible is the inescapable basis for happiness of a developed consciousness. It is the basis for satisfaction. The old saying that "virtue is its own reward" is true. To experience one's own integration is more important, more fulfilling than even the perceived certainty of continued existence.

One's "life" is more than biological existence. It is more than consciousness. It is the achievement of an integrated personality which lives for itself and nothing else. One's identity is the uppermost consideration in a triadic hierarchy. Existence is the lowest on the scale. To live as an organ of meat is vastly inferior to living as a conscious entity. But to live as a conscious entity without standard and without self-respect is inferior to the maintenance of an ethical identity. Choices requiring risk to one's existence in sustaining one's ethical identity are as objectively valid as a category. Death for the integrated personality is preferable to an irreparable betrayal of its standard.

The objective consequence of consciousness is the quest for self-perfection. There is no bigger or better thing to seek ultimately. The fact that large numbers of entities enjoying similar physiological characteristics appear to have failed in attaining an understanding of their self-identity is merely more evidence of error. It is surely not an inductive argument for the validation of an even more gross error -- the rejection of ultimate purpose and significance by those who could (and should) know better. In the same spirit, we might as well enshrine moronism as a vindication of epistemological skepticism.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 31

Warrior Ethic

The following is an attempt to answer some basic questions on the "Warrior Psychology" published in the first issue of Versus State. The article begins with an extended quote from a letter submitted to us by John Long. I consider his statement as representative of the metaphysic of muscle, or action divorced from conscious identity. My answer to Mr. Long follows his statment.

LONG'S STATEMENT

"...Slomon's statement referring to the Anarcho-capitalist warrior (sic), "The fear of death is lost in the pride of accomplishment", is functionally inaccurate. The experienced, competitively-oriented, professional military mercenary is not remotely interested in dying. Death is defeat, death is the loss of everything of real value. Faced with an absolute critical choice even surrender is preferable. Therein remains a chance to fight again and at least occupy some of the enemies time, manpower, and supplies.

"The most common causes of death and injury amongst conscripts, "citizen volunteers", and a raw militia are lack of proper training, lack of proper motivation, and lack of proper confidence. "Bad luck" trails far behind.

"The amateur soldier often believes it is "honorable" to die for his country or cause. This belief has the insidious effect of making him more susceptible to being killed or injured. This in turn makes the amateur a detriment to his military organization. In dying, or becoming injured, he increases his comrade's jeopardy. The available firepower is decreased, tactical efficacy is reduced, and an unnecessary burden is placed on logistical services.

"The professional mercenary trains and fights to win as an individual. It is as such that he is compensated. To win he must live. He must want to live more than anything else conceivable. He fears for his life. He feels the same gut-boiling, gorge-filling, diaphoretic, bladder-emptying, bowel-evacuating fear any rational human experiences in the face of violent agonizing death. He uses his fear to advantage. It motivates him to develop and hone his skills and condition to maximum potential: no holds barred.

"He learns to sublimate and control the physiological effects of fear and channel the resultant energy into clear-headed accurate situation analysis and effective violent physical action.

"What about preserving the integrity of current military intelligence. One may ask, "Is not going down fighting or suicide wisest in some situations?"

"Yes, however: any military organization that reveals tactically critical information on other than an absolute need-to-know basis, to its junior officers and ems deserves to be defeated..."

SLOMON'S ANSWER

Before commencing my rebuttal, I want to point out that my original article "The Warrior Psychology of the Anarcho-capitalist Revolutionary" does not deal with the specifics of the military occupation per se but with the warrior psychology of the revolutionary personality. In fact, in my first footnote I state that "Revolutionary

is meant in the broadest sense of new ideas and approaches", thus, it could apply to an architect, doctor, engineer, political organizer as well as to a military professional. Hence, when I asserted the disappearance of one's fear of death as a consequence of an ultimate ethical integration, I was not referring to the often necessary physiological anxiety, apprehension and fear which may grip individuals undergoing great risk of bodily harm to themselves, nor was I advocating reckless and purposeless exposure of oneself to harm or fatality. I was, rather, discussing the primacy of identity and the fulfillment of one's conscious ethical identity without the paralyzing psycho-epistemological self-doubt which afflicts advanced human beings

The fear to which I am referring is the lack of courage which comes of a failure of intellect to grasp the metaphysical givens of life and death, i.e., that the laws of reality (what Rand would call the "primacy of existence") governing non man-made universe are unalterable and that the only thing humans can change is themselves and their constructs. A warrior is, thus, one who faces the prospect of death serenely but who has the courage to live under great odds to achieve the most extremely difficult tasks at great risks to himself. Contrary to Long's belief, courageous men and women do not try to expose themselves to unnecessary risk or act recklessly as might an aberrant personality seeking a false sense of esteem. My whole statement in the "Warrior Psychology" deals with the mechanisms of maturity and not with the juvenile forms of fanaticism most generally associated with religionism. My assertion is that one's fear of dying (and of living as well!) is lost in the pride of accomplishment -- not in the dis-accomplishment of one's existence for a momentary flush of ecstasy.

The type of personality I am talking about would be far more dependable in a fire-fight or under a prolonged war than Mr. Long's mercenaries. First of all, he would be fighting because he consciously understood his cause to be true. His military professionalism would be based on his dedication to his own highly developed ethical identity -- not merely on his desires for monetary remuneration. I hasten to add that there is nothing wrong with being a mercenary -- in any field of endeavor -- only that it is inferior in terms of what the individual experiences as his identity. And, more significantly, in regards to Mr. Long's point-of-view, it is militarily inferior. Mercenaries can do an excellent job but their motivation and dependability is always questionable. People who fight for a cause, and who are willing to risk their lives when necessary (i.e. when their voluntarily accepted command structure orders), are more dependable. A general facing an enemy force composed of dedicated troops ably trained and led, must not only be able to field an ably-trained and well-led body of troops but one which is at least as dedicated. There is no substitute in warfare for dedication. And this is where Mr. Long's mercenary-survive-at-any-cost thesis flounders. It may work for mercenaries who depart when the going gets ultra-tough but it does not work for the military professional whose life is dedicated to the defense of philosophical ideals in the concrete form of a political cause. I assert that mercenaries cannot win against an equal number of equally trained, experienced and armed warriors who are dedicated to their cause and willing to die for it.

More significantly, I detect in Mr. Long's statement a mistrust of abstract ideals -- a kind of action-oriented pragmatism we have seen enthroned in the form of the Clint Eastwood-style anti-hero. Although I don't doubt the limited efficacy of this stoic breed of American cynicism, it is still an aberration rather than a model for emulation. People who have no ideals, just the tenacity to live through it all, no matter what, are distorted adaptations in a world without values. I assert their lives are meaningless to themselves in any fundamental sense. More than that, they are generally undependable in relationships which transcend personal face-to-face loyalties. This I know from experience as well as from reasoned logic. In spite of all the movies to the contrary, the motorcycle gang member, although prone to violence and reckless acts, is not a dependable anything. It is this type which one often

finds as the mercenary -- a fact well documented by their conduct in Angola and Rhodesia.

As I previously said, the Warrior Psychology is not limited to military professionals but applies universally to all individuals capable of advanced consciousness. Mr. Long's position provides no scope for a developed personal identity -- merely survived of biological existence. I assert to the contrary, that to live fully as a human being requires a defined standard of values which ultimately exceed in importance even one's continued existence. This is not an entreaty for suicide. Far from it, I call for the maintenance of personal identity come what may. If one follows the logic of Mr. Long's position to its final outcome, one would have to forsake all abstract ideals -- a loss of identity entailing a form of living death.

Having answered Mr. Long who attacks my position from one end, I will take this occasion to clarify my differences with the epistemo-ethical dualism thesis of Mr. Larry Frost.¹ This position is interesting in that it exploits the same basic ambiguity as does Mr. Long but arrives at a vastly different position though approximately equally erroneous. Mr. Frost's thesis is that to serve effectively in a military situation one must be willing to obey commands which could lead to loss of one's life, thus, one must be altruistic to serve adequately as a military professional. The philosophical consequence of this viewpoint is to dissolve the unity of any objective epistemological or ethical viewpoint. In social terms it necessitates the rise of a caste system and it is interesting that similar views are found in the Hindu caste system.

Although one can argue that rational military service does not or should not entail the equivalent of a libertarian bushido, it is obvious that circumstances may require its de facto equivalence in practice. Thus, the question enters whether, in essence, risking or giving one's life for the performance of one's mission is necessarily a sacrifice, i.e., the surrender of a higher value for a lower value. I assert it does not necessarily constitute a sacrifice if, in fact, the individual considers it of supreme importance to his identity. Although existence is necessary to consciousness and identity in an ontological sense, once evolved, one's identity must of logic become paramount in one's life. Thus, conscious identity must take precedence in a mature personality over even existence itself.

There is then no need for positing an altruistic position for the military profession which is the prime rationale for Mr. Long's exclusive mercenarism and Mr. Frost's dualist position. An individual experiences satisfaction through the use of abstract concepts. Even emotions are the result of the prior learning and acceptance of conceptual value standards. Although in defective personalities the entire process of value standards appears more or less intuitive and unexplicit, a rational and healthy personality requires definition of values at all levels. This process of precise definition of one's standard of value becomes the essence of one's life and action. As such the consistent integration of personal ethical standard and action rises with one's maturity to the pinnacle of one's priorities. There is no other process which is harmonious with a conscious entity.

In the minds of some we may still have a problem. The libertarian ethic asserts that one's life is one's highest value. That an individual is an end in himself. That achieving one's own happiness should and must be one's goal, that is if one is to be rational. Altruism and self-sacrifice are absolutely abhorant to the libertarian, as they must be to any rational being. But is there not a contradiction here between the requirements of warfare which are real and cannot be denied and the requirements of self-interest which are just as real? Does not warfare ultimately entail the notion of self-sacrifice? And if so, is it not diametrically opposed to the libertarian ideal of rational selfishness? Ethically a libertarian will never surrender a higher value for a lower value, nor can he ask it of others and remain true to his

OUR LAW

Anarcho-capitalism is the political philosophy which advocates the right of each and every individual to his own life and property. This right is seen as an ethical absolute. It cannot be infringed for any pretext, no matter how seemingly deserving or expeditious. It opposes the initiation of force and the threat of initiatory force, whether by individuals, or, by agencies asserting jurisdiction over entire populations. No individual, or group of individuals, has the right to initiate force or threaten it for any purpose. The use of defensive and retaliatory force against the initiation of force, however, does not constitute an infringement of one's right. An individual is entitled to defend and seek redress against any physical encroachment or objective physical threat to his life or property. One who initiates force, or the threat of it, either by aggressing someone's life and property, or by withholding a value rightfully belonging to someone else, forfeits his right by invading and abrogating the right of another. Thus, libertarian political doctrine limits the use of social interventionary force and (in the present context) the justifiable application of force to a purely defensive and retaliatory role. The category of "defensive" force does in principle extend to "retaliatory force"; although certain distinctions can be made between the two. The ethical principle is the individual's prerogative to defend a justifiably-acquired value from attack, theft or objective threat. Personal sovereignty, which ultimately derives from one's possession of oneself, including non-corporeal extensions, ethically mandates the assertion of one's rightful interests. The protection of one's entitlement, i.e., the ethical jurisdiction which extends over the realm of one's material properties and all accompanying prerogatives, such as use, control, disposition, modification, etc., is the logically derivable consequence of one's volitional, and, thus, rationally conscious egoistic nature. The forceful intrusion of another, and the accompanying presumption of a forced superimposition of will, debases the operative integrity of the victim's volitional capacity, and objectively necessitates counterforce for removal of the invasion.

There is some disagreement within the libertarian movement on the desirability of employing defensive force. Robert LeFevre of the extreme pacifist wing reportedly opposes the use of defensive force even to the point of not breaking apart a set of manacles belonging to one's enslaver. Most libertarians would agree, however, that an individual is entitled to defend himself with force. There is disagreement over the right of a private individual to engage in hot pursuit and circumvent the jurisdictional authority of government in executing private retaliation and enforced restitution on an aggressor. The Anarcho-capitalist position does not brook the imposition of a government monopoly over defensive force, as that is an infringement of the equal liberty of every individual to compete in the provision of these services on the free market. The individual, thus, must be free to pursue the criminal violator. The practical caveat that a plaintiff wishing to maintain the trust of his neighbors should voluntarily gain the sanction of recognized juridical authorities in the apprehension of the transgressor, does not reduce the essential freedom of choice by the individual to act in his own defense.

Ultimately, one's right to oneself is inalienable. However, responsibility for the consequences of one's actions and the consequences of agencies under one's authority or control provides the ethical basis for the forceful imposition of liability. The forced physical intrusion into someone else's life is grounds for the retaliatory removal of the physical agency performing the intrusion. The integrated nature of a volitional entity requires the redirection of force in assuring capture over the aggressive entity. A physical intrusion by an aggressor debases the ethical identity and de facto recognition of self-sovereignty to the level of a mechanistic phenomenon.

The initiation of force is ethically a self-disowning act. The assertion of elementary possession (control) over the physical instrument involved in the aggression does not require explicit transfer of entitlement as the presumption of entitlement is perceptibly abandoned. An aggressor reduces his presumable status to that of a mechanical (non self-determining) act of nature.

Anarcho-capitalism, as a political doctrine, rests on a series of more basic assumptions and premises on human nature and its psycho-epistemological and ethical requirements. The concept of "rights" which is the prime concern of Anarcho-capitalism qua political doctrine is a secondary application of the basic ethical premise of rational egoism into law. A "right" denotes a potential relationship between persons which refers to a specific ethical condition of their individual nature, and is codified as a principle in determining what may, or may not, comprise their actions towards each other.

The absolute right to one's own life and property is a logical inference from the ethical premise that a conscious being, to live qua conscious being, must be fully sovereign over the choices in its own life. This is based on the self-evidently true observation that a conscious organism should live to serve its own self-interest; that being conscious is both the means and ends of defining and attaining one's own unique happiness, success and satisfaction. The essential characteristic of consciousness is that it is self-directing as in contrast to an externally-determined mechanism. A conscious entity with its own identity requires freedom from external, coercive interventions to apply its will. The mutual recognition of that ethical requirement between individuals forms the political-legal concept of "right".

The ethic of rational egoism is based on the epistemological premise that human consciousness is capable of understanding the universe in which we live. It posits human reasoning as both necessary and sufficient to understand the nature of ourselves within the context of the phenomenal universe and to derive objectively-based values from which to make rational ethical choices.

Not all libertarians explicitly develop the ethical argument for individual rights from the ethic of rational egoism. As a consequence, many libertarians are conceptually at a loss to consistently defend the necessity of an individual's right to his (or her) own life; thus, the logically unnecessary debate over the right to abort and the non-obligatory character of various categories of "implied contracts". Even Rand herself fails to draw the full logical consequences of her ethical system, a fact thrown up to her by Roy A. Childs Jr. in 1969 (see R.A. Childs Jr., "An Open Letter to Ayn Rand: Objectivism and the State" Rational Individualist, August 1969)

The ability for evaluative choices comes from the capacity for abstracting concepts from perceptual data. There is an all-important evolutionary threshold between living organisms which are limited to more or less range-of-the-moment perceptual responses to environmental stimuli, and conscious organisms capable of inferring and abstracting relationships which can be symbolically stored for application in differing experiential contexts. Organisms operating at the perceptual level are essentially incapable of transferring object lessons into another context. Behavior is to a varying extent genetically preprogrammed. Behavioral variation is more or less limited to on-the-spot attraction and avoidance. Learning, memory and symbolic communication are extremely rudimentary, as is the potential range of individual, and, for that matter, the adaptive range of the species.

The ethic of rational egoism is based, thus, on the epistemological premise that the objective, cognitive, conceptual reasoning capacities of conscious organisms are necessary, and sufficient to derive objective value choices. This places ultimate

authority, and responsibility, for making choices, and for every other category of action, on the individual. Consciousness, and the capacity for rapid adaptation to a dynamically changing environment, is not alien to the phenomenal universe, but a natural outgrowth of its principles of organization. Thus, ethics, the science of making value choices, is neither a contradiction between human nature and the nature of reality nor is it necessarily arbitrary. It is fundamental to the conduct of a successful existence and ultimately to the fulfillment of a purposeful identity.

The relationship between an objectively-derived epistemology, and the ethic of rational egoism, is fundamental to an anarcho-capitalist political doctrine. The argument for the absolute right of the individual to his own life and property is necessarily an intellectual one. It requires a consistent and rigorous identification of premises which can account for an entire range of problems which occur in life. Other doctrines such as the complex of religio-philosophical and ideological notions which can be summarized under the multiple heading of mysticism-altruism-collectivism-statism do not require consistency in a referential sense for their "success". I have subsumed these into a blanket category called the Authoritarian Complex. Briefly, the authoritarian complex is the system of ideas and attitudes which rationalize and culturally reinforce the existing system which divests the individual of his sovereign right to his own life. Mysticism when reduced to its basic kernel asserts that the universe in which all phenomenal differences of physical, material nature and of space and time are non-existent. It further asserts that human cognitive capacities and reasoning are inferior ways of knowing to the process of faith which requires reliance on indeterminate sources. Mysticism requires divesting oneself of one's cognitive authority -- and relying on an external mythical entity or power. Altruism is the ethical doctrine which logically follows from mysticism which requires one to live in opposition to one's rational interests. Collectivism is a general heading applying to a variety of social and political doctrines which subordinate the right of the individual to the group. Statism is the organized and legal divestiture of individual authority into the hands of those holding power through the coercive monopolies of government. At every level, metaphysical, epistemological, ethical, and political-economic, the individual is divested from the authority of his world, his mind, his self-esteem, his life and property.

Every variant of the Authoritarian Complex, thus, proposes theories which provide important loopholes from reality, and with them, the sacrifice of individual rights. Anarcho-capitalism is not merely a defense of rights, it is of necessity rational selfishness, and the absolute primacy of reason in value choices. Any attempt to avoid an integrated and uncompromising defense of these principles is intellectually, and in ultimate political terms, catastrophic.

The attempt to argue from the notion of social utility as a primary argument was a crucial mistake for the nineteenth-century classical laissez-faire liberals. One which promoted the intellectual collapse of constitutional republicanism and the free market limited-state system. The argument from social utility by Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mills was an attempt to graft laissez-faire on altruist-collectivist premises. Ultimately it resulted in an ethical capitulation of laissez-faire thought. It extinguished an possibility of effective intellectual rebuttal to Marxism, and its successor, Leninist Bolshevism.

Anarcho-capitalism is more than a political doctrine merely in opposition to "the cult of the omnipotent state", as announced by the poetic, but evasive opening line of the U.S. Libertarian Party's "Statement of Principles". Radical Anarcho-capitalism is an entire way of life which stands philosophically and ideologically in irreconcilably antagonistic opposition to the dominant psychology, culture and politics of our time. Anarcho-capitalism is nothing less than the most radical and revolutionary doctrine known to the world. It is a rigorously rational and individual-

istically anti-authoritarian way of life, which must by the nature of what it entails, threaten every existing center and institution of coercive and arbitrary power on this planet. Anarcho-capitalism is the implacable foe of the State. It is the ultimate eroder of all unearned privileges, coercively imposed status, arbitrary authority and unjust use of force.

Under an anarcho-capitalist system all property would be held in private ownership. This includes all of the so-called public "services" and "utilities" such as military, police, courts, roads, schools, power generation, water, sewage, fire protection, parks, libraries, medical care, and all other categories of human transactions currently monopolized by the statist ruling class.

Property ownership is a necessary delineation of control and use by individuals and groups of individuals over physical things. Every living entity must incorporate and integrate matter and energy in order to survive. The process of growth and development in all living forms is analogous to proprietary relations among conscious organisms. The crucial difference occurs in the cognitive ability among conscious organisms to objectively distinguish the specific merits of an individual's claim to some physical entity. A claim to something is based on the investment of value in some hitherto unclaimed object or the voluntary transfer of title by the previous owner.

The concept of property is the political-legal aspect of the ethic of rational egoism. An individual's sole rational purpose in life is to attain his own self interest. There is no reasonable and objective basis in nature to argue an apriori obligation on the part of an individual to others. There are only two ways in which an individual may be ethically required to accept an obligation: (1) if he has given voluntary and explicit consent to provide a value or (2) if he has caused an objectively definable damage to someone else for which he owes restitution. Self ownership is the basis for all property ownership and is the correlary of personal sovereignty or self-dominion in the political sphere.

The distinction between "life and property" commonly employed by libertarian writers is a matter of linguistic convenience to extend the concept of individual rights to include both corporeal and non-corporeal possessions. The principle of ownership does not logically terminate with one's body -- it extends to whatever an individual has acquired by the investment of intelligence, effort, and capital, or by voluntary transfer of title. Thus, an unclaimed piece of land one has settled and worked is just as rightfully one's possession, as one's legs, arms or head.

The validity of one's claim of ownership is not reduced by the relative need of others to one's wealth, or by the relative scarcity of a value or category of value. There is, for example, a great hue and cry about the availability of "wilderness" areas for future generations. The absurdity of attempting to premise an ethically valid claim on property in the name of non-existent persons with non-existent and unknown desires is a good example of the insanity which marks "justice" in the Authoritarian Complex. It is not enough that the individual is expropriated at every turn for the living and required to shoulder the responsibilities and liabilities of the dead but now one is compelled to sacrifice for the unborn.

The weakness, incompetence, or ill fortune of others, does not constitute a valid claim to any portion of one's life, however inconsequential it may appear. This not only includes material possessions, but the knowledge and information of one's mind as well. Contrary to the belief of many libertarians, the concealment of information, or the offering of inaccurate information, does not constitute a violation of right.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 33

Cloning and Free Speech

The following is a letter to the editor printed in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer (March 28, 1978). The letter by Angela Basta for the People Against Censorship was submitted nearly a month prior to publication at the height of the controversy over David Rorvik's announcement of a successful human cloning.* Although the most banal and assinine letters on the subject were printed during this period, the PAC letter was ignored. This has often been the fate of People Against Censorship letters sent to the P-I as its staff is very partial to the American Civil Liberties Union and its primacy in First Amendment matters. Their disdain for our statement is obvious in their misleading title "Stop the Clones". Quite obviously, the letter is saying the exact opposite.

We are very disturbed by the new demands for outright censorship of David Rorvik's forthcoming work which is proclaimed as a documentation of the first cloning of a human being. If ever there was an example of the continued erosion of First Amendment rights it is in the appeal for intellectual suppression by presidential fiat by Jeremy Rifkin and Ted Howard of the so-called "Peoples Interest Commission".

We see nothing dangerous in cloning of human beings anymore than in conventional sexual reproduction. The creation of new human life is inherently a peaceful endeavor and should remain an area of unmolested private enterprise. We are not threatened (and no rational person should be) by the existence of genotypically identical persons. It is the private concern of their parents, not ours.

In any case, the voluntary and peaceful transmission of ideas and information on the subject provides no valid scope for governmental intrusion. Rifkin and Howard should be denounced for their attempt to play on the irrational fears of people to invoke authoritarian suppression of an intellectual work unmistakably protected by the First Amendment. As authors of "Who Should Play God?", Rifkin and Howard have apparently decided in their own favor.

-Angela Basta

* The hard-cover version of David Rorvik's book, In His Image, The Cloning Man is being published by J.B. Lippincott of Philadelphia. It will be published in soft-cover by Pocket Books, Inc., a division of Simon and Schuster.

LIBERTARIAN-REPUBLICAN ALLIANCE ADOPTS THE DOCTRINE OF RETALIATORY RECAPTURE

We are pleased to note the LRA's complete acceptance of our doctrine. Joseph Gentili, President of the LRA, a nationwide coalition of politically active Libertarians and conservative Republicans, said in the March 1978 issue of Limit after quoting lengthy sections of our introductory materials: "This article codifies the previously tacit underlying permises of the LRA (and all other libertarian political groups)." Though we have major disagreements on the minimal-state position with the LRA, their acceptance of our position is strong evidence of the universal appeal of our approach.

###

OUR TASKS

(Presented before the NW Radical Anarcho-capitalist Conference, August 20, 1977)

Radical libertarianism has existed in North America for over three centuries. Rhode Island, or "Rogue's Land" as it was called by the theocratically communist Puritan tyrants of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, was the site of the first historically recorded quasi-anarchist movement.¹ The original settlement of Rhode Island, pioneered by the scrupulously libertarian Roger Williams, was largely populated by refugees escaping the proto-Orwellian madness of the mainland. In time, however, the freedom-loving settlers faced a local theocratic tyrant -- a wealthy merchant named William Coddington who issued decrees and rulings as based on the "word of God". He had determined opposition in the person of Anne Hutchinson, who, although not an anarchist at first, ultimately concluded that government was immoral and unlawful. Thus, it is instructive to recall that a movement of "Baptist anarchists" was flourishing on the continent in the 1640's.

The basic conclusion of anarcho-capitalism, i.e., the idea that the individual has an absolute right to his own life and justifiably acquired property is a radical idea to be sure but it is one which grows like a persistent weed in any warm climate of freedom. We can be sure that anarchist scholars will discover "anarchoid" personalities and groups going back to the dawn of recorded history. Those tendencies are difficult to mask, even by the distorted and bureaucratic scholarship of state lackey historians. In China, for instance, there is the Taoist movement going back at least five centuries before Christ and in India there is the Chakravarti philosophical school which has been studiously avoided by modern collective-statist historians. Not surprisingly, academic scholarship fostered by altruist-collectivism and operated by government educational bureaucracies has concealed, misrepresented, and often unwittingly misinterpreted events and ideas. Our history, the history of our philosophical predecessors is not generally available to us.

The first argument always employed against anarcho-capitalism is that it has never succeeded and, thus, never will. At one time, most respectable white folk in this country really believed that blacks were subhuman and, thus, destined by fate to be slaves. Anarchists are burdened with an even greater conceptual task than black slaves in proving their ideals in the real world. For blacks, it was a matter of slaves escaping and succeeding in places where traditional slavery did not exist. The anarcho-capitalist is asked to prove the truth and workability of his ideals in a world which is totally rigged against him. Being asked to demonstrate, even on a scholarly level, the efficacy of anarcho-capitalist premises in a statist context is much like being asked by a thieving murderer who has just plundered your stock, raped your wife and butchered your children to prove to him, and his gang of psychotic lackeys, and to all of your cowering and collaborating neighbors, that living in peace and freedom is entirely feasible and desirable.

This kind of situation has resulted in the politically impotent, philosophically arcane, and ideologically irrelevant libertarian movement which we see momentarily flourishing like so many fragile wildflowers along the muddy-bloody path of collective-statism. Most so-called libertarians are nothing more than liberalized conservatives. By this it is meant, they barely understand the radical propositions that they mouth with such eloquent earnestness. They are a class of people who exist almost naked, and totally unarmed. Libertarians, even most radical libertarians, i.e., those who are "philosophical anarchists" (a term undoubtedly concocted by some slavish bureaucrat to denote the meek little housenigger who confines his anti-statist activities to parlorroom oratory and underground journals of a purely "educational" character) are intellectually disarmed by the lack of serious historical investigation elaborating

our theory of history. More than this, the only historical exemplars of physical courage and martial achievement against existing orders, are those of the pseudo "anarchists", such as anarcho-communists in tsarist Russia and the anarcho-syndacalists in Catalonia during the Spanish Civil War. Whenever a libertarian speaks of revolution with pride, it's about the American Revolution of two centuries ago.

Very few libertarians, perhaps only a handful, actually think it is possible to transform the U.S. of A. into a successful anarcho-capitalist society in this generation. Most Libertarians are thoroughly permeated by the attitudes of their bureaucratic masters. This is reflected in the literature which utters not a word about organizing a revolutionary movement. In letters and articles written in libertarian journals, revolution is universally decried as unquestionably evil. The statements are always casual mentions with no more argument than the assertion that revolution would necessitate the violation of the rights of innocent people. These so-called libertarians are like pathetic bleating sheep being led to slaughter.

Anarcho-capitalism which of its own logical consistency will become THE doctrine of the libertarian movement and the capitalist world, is by necessity a revolutionary ideology. One cannot seriously propose that the State which exists through massive coercion and slavery and which perpetuates extensive vested interests will quietly fold its tent and leave the field of battle as a result of logical suasion. And yet, one prominent anarchist who has been imprisoned for his tax resistance believes that. He thinks that a libertarian renaissance and lots of love will somehow melt the statist meanies and their hordes of constituents into sweet reasonableness. He represents, one is afraid to say, a kind of pollyanna madness which at times afflicts political visionaries. It's akin to a kind of spiritual faith-healing. Once the truth be known, then, the world will bask in new found enlightenment and reflect kindness, or so goes the feeling of, and I quote, an "emotional libertarian" as this anarchist describes himself and those he sees manning the Libber's Renaissance. Yes, and Fourier claimed that Socialism would turn the seas into lemonade!

The only active opposition to the government advocated by radical libertarians has been tax rebellion. Undoubtedly withholding payment of taxes to the government is morally justified and can be, within the proper political context, a powerful weapon to bring down the State. What traditional libertarian thinkers have ignored, however, is that tax revolt by itself achieves no significant political victory. Assuming that a widespread tax rebellion could be organized, which in itself is highly doubtful, it would still leave the basic assumptions of government and the legitimacy of coercive institutions intact. Rebellion is not revolution. It does not lead to a fundamental change in the mentality of the intelligentsia and the masses. Tax rebellion is more likely to lead to temporary concessions by the government followed later by harsh penalties against the leaders.

Thus far, I have talked only about anarchists and libertarians. The anti-statist movement, however, is much larger. It includes diverse elements such as the classical liberal conservatives, the John Birchers, the Posse Comitatus, elements of the New Left, the Reaganites, Wallace-ites, Bukley-ites and many others. All of these groups, except perhaps for the Posse, which appears to be a form of grass-roots anarchism, suffers from contradictory premises. They are prone to support government intervention for various reasons. All of this is well known, but they share with us a growing sense of alarm, and opposition against the growth of State power. Unfortunately, in its present fragmented condition the anti-statist movement stands very little chance of substantially modifying government or of stemming its growth.

Libertarians have traditionally been opposed to radical mass politics for fear of creating something worse.² This inhibition has stultified the entire anti-statist

movement. Instead of providing intellectual and ideological leadership to a coherent anti-statist movement, radical libertarians have reduced their impact to the point of invisibility. As a result, the anti-statist movement, if one can call it a movement, has no ideology and no plan of action. Thus, the first task for radical anarcho-capitalists is to establish a coherent program within existing conditions which can bring about radical political change in this country. Its objective must be the abolition of the State. This objective can and must be achieved in our generation.

This program for the abolition of the State rests on the following basic assumptions. The first being that it is morally right for individuals to organize in groups to physically fight back against the State and to employ every means including the power of the State against the State. This is the doctrine of retaliatory recapture. Although it is true that nearly all of the material means of state power have been stolen from individuals (many of whom support government voluntarily out of a sense of duty, patriotism and even from a misguided sense of self-interest); those who choose to actively defend themselves against statist coercion have the ethical right to employ any physical means controlled by the State to contravene its power. Most libertarians are under the misconception that any use of stolen property automatically renders one an accomplice to theft. It does not. There is no rational obligation to the original owner on the part of a victim who is suffering the consequences of the stolen goods in the hands of government officials. Anyone who permits the use of his or her property by a thief or anyone else for that matter, in the abuse of others has no ethical claim against them if these victims wrest control over that property to terminate the continuing threat of abuse or in restitution for damages already caused. The original owner may, of course, lay claim to his stolen property but he must direct himself to the thief proper for restoration or restitution. One may not demand others to sacrifice their own defense in deference to one's stolen property -- especially when one is making no effort to retrieve that property.

In practical terms, this means that an anarcho-capitalist political movement should seek to gain control over every means of state power. The State is a functioning machine -- every element of which contributes to its maintenance of power and coercion -- one cannot artificially divide (as many libertarians are prone to do) between the obviously coercive parts such as the IRS and the "relatively legitimate" aspects such as the courts and military. We must be willing and able to take control of any and all parts of the functioning apparatus of the State for our own long-term use. The defeat of statism is a long process. We cannot hope to win unless we can divert money, supplies and position from the State. We must stop being productive slaves and become constantly transformative of state power, in part, by siphoning government resources into anti-government activities.

The second basic assumption is that we must have a radical ideology which translates basic abstract philosophical premises into concrete political doctrine. Anarcho-capitalist ideology must specifically address every oppressed group which is in some way suffering its own particular problem with the State. Although the entire format of our philosophy should always serve as background for our special interest group approach, we must concentrate on the gut issues. Every actual and potential conflict by various interests must be exploited with specific interpretations of the problem placing it within the context of an overall analysis of the world situation. The major components of our ideological format should be:

1. The anarcho-capitalist interpretation of history with a particular emphasis on events since Renaissance times and the colonization of the New World. The scholarship of such revisionist historians such as James Martin and Murray Rothbard must be reduced into a concise and integrated historical world view which relates the events of America's part with present conditions. Our history must be readily understand-

able to the masses and appealing to the young.

2. It should provide an integrated strategic and tactical intellectual format for world revolution and for overcoming all major problems in readily appreciable terms. We must explain in detail how we intend to resolve unemployment, inflation, crime in the streets, education, area defense, world peace, health problems, management of environment-ecology. Anarcho-capitalist ideology must provide the basis for specific platforms for national revolutionary parties.
3. The third major ideological component must be a link between science and politics. We must demonstrate the scientific coherence of our humanistic statements with the basic principles of science. This link must be readily understandable to the masses. Our propaganda must build confidence in the capacity of a revolutionary anarcho-capitalist leadership to bring about a better and more secure future.
4. Radical anarcho-capitalist ideology must provide a basis for dealing with emotional and psychodynamic problems so prevalent in authoritarian societies. Not only must we deal with this theoretically and therapeutically as is being done by Nathaniel Branden now, but we must employ mass culture media to therapize on the most primitive levels. We should be providing role-models and advice to the lovelorn. Sex, romance, and family -- these are what count to most people.

Having outlined the major components of an anarcho-capitalist ideology we can proceed to the last major assumption necessary for the abolition of the State: the development of a professional revolutionary cadre. There is no substitute for total professional dedication. Undoubtedly, we must have the active support of large numbers of part-timers and the passive "moral" support of the masses, but without a militant vanguard we cannot confront and defeat our enemies. Until we are ready to do so, we will lack credibility, we will as a movement lack the hard nucleus around which to organize, and our propagation will remain weak, diffuse and ultimately ineffective. It is instructive to note what has happened in country after country which has lost to the collective-statists. In Cambodia for example, several million people may have been slaughtered, in the Soviet Union between fifty and a hundred million have been sent to slave labor camps, in China forty million were purged in the first decade and the list goes on and on. This madness comes of a natural progression of collective-statism -- it happened in Germany, and in the U.S. of A. our government interned the Japanese. We must begin organizing a political army.

The last major assumption necessary to accomplishing the abolition of the State is the organizing of parallel institutions which not only permit us to handle the problems of underground organization but which will provide the transitional mechanisms to forming an anarcho-capitalist society. We must begin building anarchy now by developing underground courts, police and military systems. Libertarians, and all anti-statists must understand that there is no effective way to achieve liberty in a real sense that does not involve breaking the law. I.e. if you want to be a real anarcho-capitalist and not merely an "philosophical anarchist" token statist house-nigger, you have to be a lawbreaker. The statist law is constructed in such a manner as to make lawful institutional change impossible in any practicable sense.

With these points in mind we can broach the subject of formulating the present tasks for the anti-statist movement. First of all, we must realize that the only true anti-statist movement is Radical Anarcho-capitalism. An objectively integrated, real world philosophy does not permit mere abstract pronouncements which are not linked to activities ultimately sufficient to resolve an ethical problem.

This is the problem with the U.S. Libertarian Party. Its platform and principles sort of add up to a minimal state with strong hints that this is only transitional to

a no-state condition. The LP has no workable ideology, no program of transitional mechanics, its leadership is composed of comfortably ensconced academics and liberalized conservative business administrators. The Party's rank and file are largely made up of young middle class careerist professionals momentarily sowing their wild political oats before settling down with a family and a status position in the Republican Party. The intellectual base of the LP is a failure because it has provided no direction for these momentarily liberalized conservatives. The Party has no strategy. Its tactical repertoire is a faint reflection of the major parties. Predictably, the LP will fail in this country unless it is radicalized and disciplined. Its crucial failure at this time, however, is its lack of strong moral leadership and disciplined tactical planning.

Having said this, it must be admitted that the LP is politically the only large-scale organization with a quasi-anarcho-capitalist philosophy. Even its weak example has been sufficient to enthuse the formation of libertarian parties in Canada, Australia and New Zealand. It must be understood, however, that if the example of the U.S. of A. party holds true for all, that these parties will fail. And this should not disturb us as these organizations represent a phase in the development of the Radical Anarcho-capitalist movement.

It is within this frame of considerations that the near-term tasks of the radical anti-statist movement becomes apparent. The first task is the refinement and propagation of our revolutionary viewpoint to other anti-statist elements who could lean our way. We must fleshout and extend our ranks. Thus, our most immediate task is the construction and propagation of a new goal horizon for the anti-statist movement and the simultaneous induction of the "charter" membership. This is the reason, by the way, for the Conference to get some geographical spread in preparation for an international organization.

The second task is the organization of a committed core group. Preferably this group would be composed of full-time organizers residing in different states and capable of attracting nuclei of committed part-timers. The first objective is to establish a rudimentary economic base for political activities. Each core member should have a highly sympathetic woman or man friend willing and able to contribute economic support indefinitely. Core organizers should also seek to supplement their income base with welfare, unemployment, food stamps, or an easy government bureaucratic or menial positions. A government job can be the source of almost endless supplies, needed material as well as important information.

The third task is infiltrating "friendly" organizations and gaining influence. This can only be carried out under circumstances where the level of participation required is minimal. Good opportunities exist in the Republican Party. Every effort should be made to be selected as delegates to state and national conventions. All political organizations have their disenchanted minorities and fringe elements. With proper tactics it is easy to amplify our position with this support through radical planks. We can move large but tactically weak political organizations by forming a well disciplined minority within each party. We must split and destabilize counter-revolutionary conservative and reformist forces while continuously moving the "center-moderate" position ever more closely to the radical position. We must speak continuously on the floor of deliberative bodies, we must drown out our opponents. Three or four of us can and must be of equal impact to a convention of hundreds.

The fourth task must involve a direct approach to youth and to underage minors. The young form the numerically greatest category of oppressed in the world and in our country. They suffer the greatest physical pain, humiliation, degradation and divestiture of legal rights. They constitute the category with the least invested in the present system. We must study the problems of youth and we must develop our

CONTINUED ON PAGE 34

Double Standard!

Just as the United Nation's condemnations of South Africa occur with the seeming inevitability of taxes and bureaucratic venality, there is another process which also seems endemic to our modern world. I refer to the political and moral hypocrisy pervading most questions African. While Idi Amin of Uganda continues to slaughter his citizenry with model amplitude and ferocity and while numberless African tyrants belabor their subjects with horrors not imputed to South Africa by even its most impassioned critics -- while misery and terror have made Africa their home, the attention of the world and our campus newspaper focuses almost entirely upon the tempered injustices in South Africa. It is as though our scribblers have decided to vent their rage upon pre-World War II Polish anti-semitism while scarcely uttering a syllable about Hitler's concentration camps.

Recently, the Rand Daily Mail devoted a front page article condemning the murder of an outstanding Black African leader, one Mr. Stephen Biko. The newswriter could "only express our sense of shock and outrage ... We have been deeply concerned for a long time at the way people keep on dying while in the hands of the security police... This is the first time a major black leader has died in the hands of the security police." There is much to be gleaned from these editorial sentiments: 1) The staff of the South African security police contains some pretty nasty thugs who enjoy their work; 2) By African standards, the number of dissenters done to death is small; and 3) The South African press is relatively free and, in fact, daily illumines outrages committed by the regime. In short, South Africa is a country with damnably too much oppression.

But having criticized pre-World War II Polish anti-semitism, is it kosher to condemn Hitler's concentration camps? From the amount of criticism accorded "progressive" African governments in the campus newspaper and elsewhere (To wit: almost none), such condemnation would appear to be very much against the rules. For the remainder of this article, this writer will play devil's advocate and break the rules by placing the violations of human rights in South Africa within the context of the African continent.

Marxist Mozambique recently established several "political re-education centers" peopled by several thousand prisoners suspected of having violated "identity card" regulations. The Orwellian terminology here is enriched by the official description of the prisoners' day which begins with "physical fitness training" at four in the morning. Unless one's brains have completely melted, one can easily guess the nature of this "physical fitness training"; I say "guess" because, as one writer observed, the main flaw in the re-education process is "arbitrary detention and lack of clear release procedure". In short, no one has survived to tell us what it was like -- that "physical fitness training". One witty observer, while deploring the absence of habeas corpus in a pestiferous hole like Mozambique, brightly conceded the substitution of the politically more convenient habeas cadaver.

If Mozambiquian penology seems unenlightened, the level of democratic governance in Africa is only minimally higher. In Mobutu's Zaire, elections occur without an opposition, since Mr. Mobutu has declared himself his country's "guide" and has announced his "marriage" to his people. And as a good husband ought to act, he has personally outlined the shape of Zaire's social and political life: "Authenticity is the ideology; authentic Zairian nationalism is the doctrine; and the return to authenticity is the method. Together the three stages represent Mobutism, the thought and reason of Mobutu." If one should find "the thought and reason of Mobutu" to be, frankly speaking, appalling? Well, one's fate might parallel that of an entire political party in Seychelles where the self-styled Marxist, Mr. Albert Rene, recently seized power

from the leader of Seychelles' Democratic Party, one Mr. Jimmy "Jet Set" Mancham. When queried about the future of the Democratic Party, Mr. Rene responded, "It has not been banned. It has simply disappeared." Once again, unless one's brains have self-destructed, it is not difficult to imagine how an entire party "simply disappeared".

The above imperfect understanding of republican democracy has a further expression in African legal institutions. In Mr. Sekou Torre's Guinea there are "economic police" (That conjures up a picture, does it not?) who meddle in everything which attracts their attention. Recently, a large number of African market women marched on Mr. Torre's residence to protest the doings of the "economic police"; several were shot down and the remainder faced trial before that model judicial organ, the Tribunal of the National Revolutionary Council.

And while on the subject of the creative use of militias, Mr. Obasanjo, the Nigerian Head of State, has lately been ventilating on the need for "discipline at all levels of Nigerian life." Therefore, soldiers are now in classrooms "to enforce discipline in Nigerian schools." One Nigerian colonel, taking his cue from rhetoric common in Mozambique, noted that "the soldiers would assist in physical training and coaching sports, and ensure orderliness during outings."

Despite the misery suggested in these horror stories, the above rulers and their countries are by no means the worst in Africa. What about the trouble spots? There is the area which was once Spanish Equatorial Africa. According to a recent article in the New York Times, the country has become literally "depopulated" -- what with refugees escaping the Marxist regime and large numbers of those citizens remaining adorning town streets as corpses. Or there is Mr. Said Barre's Somalia where it is punishable by death to speak with a foreigner. Or there is Mr. Mengistu's Ethiopia where one London Spectator correspondent reported the execution of "dozens of hundreds" of students and who described a "dawn parade of 100,000 peasant soldiers, with Russian weapons and North Korean uniforms, who marched through the streets shouting 'Death! Death!'" Or there is Mr. Idi Amin's Uganda..., etc.

So, what is the point of this article? Ought we Westerners to tone down our criticism of South Africa? No. South African racial policies deserve their lumps; the rage of an ambitious Black in South Africa can only be appreciated if we multiply by a hundred times the anger experienced by white males who have experienced, if usually only mildly, Affirmative Action injustices. The point of this article is to offer campus readers a wider perspective on African affairs and to suggest that having brutalized old-fashioned Polish anti-semitism, there is still room for adverse comment on Hitler's concentration camps.

-Larry C. Parr

RADICAL ANARCHO-CAPITALISM - Continued from page 8

advanced stages of tyrannical violence, and that its final stage requires mass incarceration and slaughter of all potential oppositional forces.

In contrast to the moderate, pacifistic and reformist and retreatist libertarians which now dominate the movement, we assert the need to prepare for revolutionary political action. Adoption of a revolutionary programme requires a number of preliminary preparations. The most important is the explicit adoption of a Radical Anarcho-capitalist objective of abolishing and dismantling the State with no acceptance of the intermediary minimal-state stage. In doing this we must understand that there is no

contradiction between what is ethically desirable and what is "practical". Human identity requires freedom whatever the difficulties. We must be prepared from the outset to maintain the Revolution against any reactionary attempt to re-establish coercive jurisdictional monopolies. We already know that every governmental function presently monopolized and coercively imposed by the State can be more efficiently and justly provided by voluntary free market means. This includes the police, courts and military functions.

An equally important preparation prior to the adoption of a revolutionary programme is full acceptance of a total war stance regarding the State. We must accept the necessity and desirability of creating underground police, courts and military from the outset. These institutions must be integrated with black market commercial operations and above-ground reform political parties and other fronts. We must organize a military force eventually capable of providing effective area defense for the national political region in question during the depowering of the State apparatus. Our revolution must never suffer the consequences of the French Revolution of 1789 or of the Kerensky Government in the Russian Revolution. If we plan to succeed, we must plan from the outset to protect the Revolution from powerful internal forces of reaction and attack from abroad. Our military forces will be sustained upon the defeat of the State by their ownership of the Federal Lands having no present rightful owners. The proceeds from the lease and sale of these lands will insure the strength and independence of our revolutionary military forces.

Military force is essential to the establishment of a revolutionary programme. Without it, the abolitionist political forces will have no means for retaliation against statist attack or for maintaining disciplinary action against non-statist brigands and those who betray our cause through breach of agreement. For example, we will need large and constant sources of capitalization -- one of the main sources of which will be illicit commercial operations. We will not only have to be able to defend ourselves against the State but against the predations of established criminal syndicates which already operate as an arm of statist coercion. The present extent of "Organized Crime" revenues is estimated at 100 billion dollars annually. There is no reason why eventually the Radical Anarcho-capitalist movement should not coopt this economic base.

Thus, from the outset, a revolutionary programme must consider three separate but interrelated levels and spheres of operations. The most basic is the revolutionary military underground for without it, nothing can be effected in concrete political terms. No one will respect our movement, and few will join us unless we have the demonstrated muscle to defend our interests and to retaliate against aggressors. Even our ability to operate on a politically "above-ground" basis will be directly related to our underground strength. Winning elections means controlling neighborhoods, and demonstrating street-level strength to the workaday masses. We must be able to remedy injustice on a personal level in direct defiance of the State's monopolies. We cannot win at the polls in any widespread sense until the people lose their respect for the State as the ultimate power in their lives. Only with well organized armed force strictly directed and motivated by an explicit programme and ethical code, can our above-ground politics gain support and acceptance. Abolition of the State can have no credibility unless it is backed by armed force. The ineffectuality of the present moderate Anarcho-capitalist-led Libertarian Party is due precisely to: (1) a lack of defined transitional plans, and (2) a lack of credible, physical means. The people are no fools. They know libertarianism must abolish the State and to do that, it must have the ability and willingness to employ force.

The natural alliance between our black market commercial operations, above-ground political apparatus and our underground revolutionary forces must be worked out in

formal accord as between private firms. Our political apparatus will, of course, not be limited to one party but will operate in all practical spheres - Democratic, Republican, Libertarian, Socialist, etc. Political candidates for office covertly in support of our position (or at least willing to collaborate for non-ideological purposes) will, according to agreement, receive our support in return for their aid in office. All of this will require a powerful economic base able to produce high rates of return on investment. Not only will the black market underground provide funds for "buying" politicians but all-necessary forms of intelligence gathering and illicit skills for the political apparatus.

Our military force must of course be voluntary, however, once volunteers have accepted contractual obligations to serve they may, as stipulated in their agreement, lose their life for failure to perform assigned duties or betraying their associates. These and other problems arising within the revolutionary apparatus will have to be adjudicated by underground courts through the application of our own legal system.

- Parsons Lingg

SPLITTING UP! - Continued from page 12

sion of Anarcho-capitalist theory. We should be glad that Efron is accentuating the differences between minarchists and anarchists, as it will permit the formulation of a revolutionary programme unhindered by constitutionalist republican misgivings or faint-heartedness. The programme must, of course, move irreconcilably and unalterably towards the total abolition and dismantlement of the State. Only by providing a radically different alternative to Statism which is logically consistent can we hope to attract the support of the American people. Efron's minimal statism has no chance of doing this. It may have some transient appeal to that sector of society which momentarily benefits from statist capitalism or who suffer from the chauvinist cultural nostalgia of a bygone era but ultimately it will fail. Anarcho-capitalism is the future, Statism the past. We have a total cure for the ills of our epoch. Those who hate Communism, not only in form but in essence, should join us, for we are the true antagonists and ideological conquerors of altruist-collectivism. Efron and the rest of the Objectivist debacle have no chance of defeating Communism through statism of any kind, they will only contribute to its rise as did the misguided Conservatism of Bismark, Hitler, Nixon et al.

Vanquish the State!

CONSCIOUSNESS, IDENTITY, AND NATURAL RIGHTS - Continued from page 14

As things get more complex the chances for error increases and with it the success rate falls. In evolved conscious beings, however, survival is ultimately a concern of the individual. The actual experience of one's consciousness ultimately becomes the overriding value. The disintegration of one's neighbor organisms is not proof for the dismissal of identity. A conscious organism does not live to copy error -- that would be against its developed nature. And, in fact, the whole idea of consciousness is development. The inherent dynamism of consciousness and its ethical crystallization goes against the simplistic Goodson-Longinotti ploy which substitutes a static reification of what has to be a process. A process, which in terms of human experience and psycho-epistemology must take place in the a-historical Now. Thus, ethical identity, the personal experience of one's worth, of one's own existentially consistent geometry of value, is probably the most direct, most knowable phenomenon of a conscious life.

The nature of rational consciousness is essential for the understanding of Anarcho-capitalist ethics and rights theory. Conventional statist ideologies obscure the overriding importance of consciousness and identity. This partly motivated by the altruist-collectivist demand for the egalitarian reduction of the role of the basic egoism of individuals. Our whole philosophy and political ideology rests on volitional consciousness and ethical identity as objective necessities of a developed human nature.

- Richard R. Slomon

WARRIOR ETHIC - Continued from page 17

own credo. And this is fine in capitalist society where rational self-interest leads individuals to create and produce values for voluntary exchange in the marketplace. Each trades goods of lower value to himself than those he receives in exchange. This is the basis for Creator Class life, outside of thwarting certain criminal aberrations, the conflict level of war as I have defined it does not fit. Is there an unbridgeable epistemological and ethical dichotomy between Creator and Warrior in libertarian society?

No there is not. The Warrior does not surrender a higher value for a lower value which is the essence of a sacrificial act. The essential idea of a libertarian Creator is that as a being he maintains integrity by living according to his nature. This means his life's profession, is to meet the challenge of real conditions and triumph over them. The consciousness that he is doing this is the basis for his self-esteem and fulfillment, i.e., his happiness. The sum of the values he consciously holds and the attitudes which he has carefully adopted the requirements of his life are the components of his identity. His physical existence is not denied but ultimately it is the values which he identifies as himself which are supreme in his life. The requirements of being a Warrior or meeting the challenge of reality fully and unequivocally are exactly the heroic requirements in principle which rule the life of the Creator. By triumphing in meeting the requirements of his profession, the Warrior is being selfish in the most ultimate sense. He will permit nothing from interfering from his maximizing of his own self-identity. Not even the continuation of his own physical existence.

In fact, this primacy of self-identity is the basis for the heroism of the fictional characters depicted in Ayn Rand's novels Atlas Shrugged and The Fountainhead. It is discernable in a number of professions. These include architect, steelmaker, miner, and scientist. The principle interest of each characterization is in the integrity of their work as the central validation of one's life to oneself. The primary interest is not in physical survival per se but in maintaining an integrity of values with the requirements of life as a whole. Ironically, it is the Warrior's epistemological requirement in the necessity of his work, of his mission, which highlights the true heroism of libertarian selfishness. A selfishness which springs from a maximal identification with truth. A selfishness which is the willingness to wrench a consciously explicit self-identity from the jaws of fear and ambivalence.

- Richard R. Slomon

FOOTNOTES

1. L.A. Frost, "Military Affairs - Warrior Ethic and Free Society", Quest, Vol. 1, No. 1, February, 1975, and in "Military Affairs - De Novo", Quest, Vol. 1., No. 2, March, 1975.

I have written several essays on the invalidity of fraud as a legitimate libertarian prohibition. Fraud punishes an individual for providing false information or for concealing information for gain. The usual argument for the prohibition against fraud is that it results in the transfer of a value which the victim would have been unwilling to give had the accurate or full information been made available by the other party. The case against the prohibition of fraud is that the commission of deceit, is not in itself an act which objectively violates an individual's right. The provision of information or the withholding of information are within the legitimate prerogatives which an individual may exercise over his possessions. Giving away false information does not entitle the recipient to a valid claim to damages. The fraud notion is also wrong because it involves penalty for intent and not the objective character and consequence of the action itself. Fraud is further invalidated by its dependence on arbitrary and changing social convention and community standards on "how much information and how accurate".

A consistent application of rational egoism (i.e. the Libertarian Ethic) leads to the conclusion that an individual has but one right -- that is the right to his own life and property (as an extension of that life). As such, he can make no ethically valid claim (and thus legally valid claim as the bases for police intervention must proceed from the application and codification of more fundamental ethical premises) against someone else's life, unless at least one of the two previously described conditions is met. This includes information, knowledge, and all other capacities of one's mind possessions. They are products of one's prior investment and acquisitions. The concept of fraud as it is defined in common law has no validity in a libertarian code of ethics or much less a rational code of law. As is the case with any other possession, an individual may not be forced to provide accurate information in any transaction unless by so doing he transfers title to that particular informational value and must provide the value as stipulated. Failure to do so, would constitute forcible withholding of a value belonging to someone else and, thus, a form of initiating a forcible imposition over a portion of someone else's life.

A consistent application of libertarian premises permits no ethical validity or enforcement of so called "implied contracts". Libertarianism requires the communication of explicit and voluntary consent in the transfer of title over any value. Anything less, admits to the validity of imposing arbitrary and subjective claims based upon variable "community" standards. The notion of "implied contract" is a contradiction in terms. A contract consists of defined terms, the extent of liability and other obligations. Logical inferences from the stipulated terms are objectively delimitable. The extent of the agreement, however, is basically controlled by the explicit and defined nature of its specific terms. An individual is responsible for his own actions, not for the interpretations or assumptions of others unless he communicates a specific transfer of title over some portion of his life. The use of concepts to communicate a willingness to undertake an obligation is necessary to supplant the ambiguity of perceptual-level determination of assent. The transmission of symbolologically specific information which defines intent in oral or written form provides a threshold of conceptually-explicit validation.

- Richard R. Slomon

ANITA URGES PRISON FOR GAYS

The PAC does not advocate homosexuality but we think government suppression of consenting sexual acts is wrong. Although we oppose anti-discrimination laws for gays in private employment and rental policies, we are horrified by Anita Bryant's demands for the imposition of 20 year felony penalties for homosexual acts. This is just more evidence of the direct relationship between Christian beliefs and statist coercion.

###

capacities to work with them. Demographically, politically and militarily we stand no chance of victory unless we can appeal to youth. As part of this we must work to bring about the abolition of public education. The PS system, not the postal service, must be our prime institutional point of attack. This is their achilles heel and our greatest opportunity.

The last of the near-term tasks which should be accomplished within two years is the convening of an international radical anti-statist conference to begin organizing a world revolutionary movement. At this point we can begin the development of an international court of justice and an intelligence network.

FOOTNOTES

- Richard R. Slomon

1. Murray N. Rothbard, "Individualist Anarchism in the United States: The Origins", Libertarian Analysis, Vol. 2, No. 1, Winter 1970, p. 5.

2. James J. Martin, the libertarian revisionist historian warns of the risks of "radical political activity along the traditional lines of mass politics" and offers little hope of reversing the statist tide in the early future. James J. Martin in the "Introduction" to Benjamin R. Tucker, State Socialism and Anarchism and Other Essays, (Colorado Springs, Ralph Myles Publishers, Inc., 1972) p. 9-10 and in Reason Magazine interview ("Introducing Revisionism", January 1976, Vol. 7, No. 9) p. 21.

(advertisement)

M E R I T is the American Way

Movement to End Racial Injustice and Tyranny - 8314 Mary Ave. N.W. - Seattle, WA 98117
(206) 782-4651

Dear Friend: The injustice of racial discrimination is quite apparent to any thinking person who believes that individuals should be judged and advanced through their particular abilities, attributes, and merit. So-called "Affirmative Action programs" were seemingly conceived to prevent racial injustice but in sum and substance they do exactly the opposite. "Affirmative Action" merely imposes the burden of racial discrimination upon a new group of individuals rather than attempting to alleviate it entirely.

Unfortunately the advocates of this old bigotry with a new target find themselves well entrenched in governmental and institutional circles. They call upon you to forego advancement in your individual life which you have earned through your own ingenuity and industry so that someone less qualified, by every objective color-blind criteria, may take your place. If you oppose denying a person a job, an advancement, or a place in an educational institution simply because of the color of his skin; if you believe that individuals should be advanced and judged by their merit alone, then we ask you to join with us to make our voices heard.

MERIT, a non-profit, public service corporation, is developing an educational campaign to mobilize public opinion as to the danger of racial and sexual quotas and preferences inspired under the umbrella of Affirmative Action.

Unfortunately the advocates of Affirmative Action will not go away without a fight. MERIT is prepared, with your help, to launch an aggressive campaign to mobilize public sentiment against so-called "Affirmative Action programs", to identify the position of legislators and congressmen on key programs; and to engage in litigation where necessary to help promote the objectives of the organization.

Twenty-five dollars will pay your first year's dues in MERIT, will entitle you to receive the organization's newsletter, and, most of all, to provide some of the necessary financial support for a new kind of "affirmative action".

Very truly yours,

Richard R. Slomon

Richard R. Slomon, Executive Director for MERIT